

4536

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
 KENT M. ROGER, State Bar No. 95987
 HERMAN J. HOYING, State Bar No. 257495
 JENNIFER L. CALVERT, State Bar No. 258018
 One Market, Spear Street Tower
 San Francisco, CA 94105-1126
 Tel: 415.442.1000
 Fax: 415.442.1001
 kroger@morganlewis.com
 hhoying@morganlewis.com
 jennifer.calvert@morganlewis.com

 Attorneys for Defendants
 HITACHI, LTD., HITACHI DISPLAYS, LTD.,
 HITACHI ELECTRONIC DEVICES (USA), INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 (SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION)

STATE OF OREGON, *ex rel.* John Kroger,
Attorney General,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AU OPTRONICS CORPORATION, *et al.*,

Defendants.

This Document Relates to Individual Case No.
3:10-cv-4346 SI

Master File No. 3:07-md-1827

MDL No. 1827

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER
REGARDING TIME TO RESPOND TO
AMENDED COMPLAINT**

1 WHEREAS plaintiff State of Oregon (“Oregon”) filed the above captioned lawsuit on
2 August 10, 2010;

3 WHEREAS Oregon filed a first amended complaint on April 15, 2011 (“Amended
4 Complaint”);

5 WHEREAS Defendants Hitachi Displays, Ltd., Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA), Inc.
6 and Hitachi, Ltd. (collectively, the “Hitachi Defendants”) and Defendants Chi Mei Corporation,
7 Chi Mei Innolux Corporation, CMO Japan Co., Ltd., and Chi Mei Optoelectronic USA, Inc.
8 (collectively, the “Chi Mei Defendants”) jointly filed with other defendants a motion to dismiss
9 Count III in its entirety and Count IV to the extent it seeks “disgorgement of profits” as a remedy
10 on June 6, 2011;

11 WHEREAS the Court denied Defendants’ joint motion to dismiss Counts III and IV of the
12 Amended Complaint on July 12, 2011;

13 WHEREAS all defendants, including the Hitachi Defendants and Chi Mei Defendants,
14 entered into a stipulation with Oregon on July 21, 2011 that Defendants’ deadline to answer the
15 Amended Complaint was August 12, 2011;

16 WHEREAS on July 21, 2011, the Court entered an order extending Defendants’ deadline
17 to answer the Amended Complaint until August 12, 2011;

18 WHEREAS the Hitachi Defendants and Chi Mei Defendants entered into a stipulation
19 with Oregon on August 11, 2011 that the Hitachi Defendants’ and Chi Mei Defendants’ deadline
20 to answer the Amended Complaint is September 12, 2011;

21 WHEREAS on August 24, 2011, the Court entered an order extending the Hitachi
22 Defendants’ and Chi Mei Defendants’ deadline to answer the Amended Complaint until
23 September 12, 2011;

1 WHEREAS the Hitachi Defendants and Chi Mei Defendants entered into a stipulation
2 with Oregon on September 9, 2011 that the Hitachi Defendants' and Chi Mei Defendants'
3 deadline to answer the Amended Complaint is September 26, 2011;

4 WHEREAS on September 13, 2011, the Court entered an order extending the Hitachi
5 Defendants' and Chi Mei Defendants' deadline to answer the Amended Complaint until
6 September 26, 2011;

7 WHEREAS the Hitachi Defendants and Chi Mei Defendants entered into a stipulation
8 with Oregon on September 23, 2011 that the Hitachi Defendants' and Chi Mei Defendants'
9 deadline to answer the Amended Complaint is November 4, 2011;

10 WHEREAS on September 28, 2011, the Court entered an order extending the Hitachi
11 Defendants' and Chi Mei Defendants' deadline to answer the Amended Complaint until
12 November 4, 2011;

13 WHEREAS the Hitachi Defendants and Chi Mei Defendants entered into a stipulation
14 with Oregon on November 3, 2011 that the Hitachi Defendants' and Chi Mei Defendants'
15 deadline to answer the Amended Complaint is December 9, 2011;

16 WHEREAS on November 4, 2011, the Court entered an order extending the Hitachi
17 Defendants' and Chi Mei Defendants' deadline to answer the Amended Complaint until
18 December 9, 2011;

19 WHEREAS the Hitachi Defendants and Chi Mei Defendants entered into a stipulation
20 with Oregon on December 6, 2011 that the Hitachi Defendants' and Chi Mei Defendants'
21 deadline to answer the Amended Complaint is January 13, 2012;

22 WHEREAS on December 12, 2011, the Court entered an order extending the Hitachi
23 Defendants' and Chi Mei Defendants' deadline to answer the Amended Complaint until January
24 13, 2012;

1 WHEREAS extending the Hitachi Defendants' and Chi Mei Defendants' time to respond
2 to the Amended Complaint will not alter the date of any other event or deadline already fixed by
3 the Court;

4 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and among the
5 undersigned counsel, on behalf of their respective clients, Oregon, on the one hand, and the
6 Hitachi Defendants and Chi Mei Defendants on the other hand, as follows:

7
8 Hitachi Defendants and Chi Mei Defendants will have until March 2, 2012 to answer
9 Oregon's Amended Complaint.

10 Dated: January 11, 2012

11 HAGLUND KELLEY HORNGREN JONES & WILDER
12 LLP

13 /s/ Michael K. Kelley

14 Michael E. Haglund (SBN 772030)

15 Michael K. Kelley (SBN 853782)

16 Shay S. Scott (SBN 934214)

17 HAGLUND KELLEY HORNGREN JONES & WILDER
18 LLP

19 200 SW Market Street, Suite 1777

20 Portland, OR 97201

21 Tel: (503) 225-0777

22 Fax: (503) 225-1257

23 mhaglund@hk-law.com

24 *Counsel for State of Oregon*

25 OREGON SENIOR ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

26 Tim D. Nord (SBN 882800)

27 1162 Court Street, NW

28 Salem, OR 97301-4096

Tel: (503) 947-4333

Fax: (503) 225-1257

tim.d.nord@state.or.us

Counsel for State of Oregon

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

/s/ Kent M. Roger

Kent M. Roger (SBN 95987)
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
One Market, Spear Street Tower
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: (415) 442-1000
Fax: (415) 442-1001
kruger@morganlewis.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Hitachi, Ltd., Hitachi Displays,
Ltd., and Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA), Inc.*

SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT LLP

/s/ Harrison J. Frahn IV

Harrison J. Frahn IV (SBN 206822)
SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT LLP
2550 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, CA 94304
Tel: (650) 251-5000
Fax: (650) 251-5002
hfrahn@stblaw.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Chi Mei Corporation,
Chimei Innolux Corporation, Chi Mei Optoelectronics USA,
Inc., and CMO Japan Co., Ltd.*

FILER'S ATTESTATION

I, Kent M. Roger, am the ECF user whose identification and password are being used to file this Stipulation and [Proposed] Order. In compliance with General Order 45.X.B, I hereby attest that Michael M. Kelley and Harrison J. Frahn IV concur in this filing.

/s/ Kent M. Roger

Kent M. Roger

Attorneys for Defendants Hitachi, Ltd., Hitachi Displays, Ltd., and Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA), Inc.

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Pursuant to the parties' stipulation set forth above and pursuant to Rule 6-1(a) of the Civil
Local Rules, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January ~~12~~, 2012

By 

HON. SUSAN ILLSTON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE